SUBMITTED TO *the Astrophysical Journal* (2016 October 5)
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1610.01701v1 [astro-ph.GA] 6 Oct 2016

REFLECTION SYMMETRIES OF ISOLATED SELF-CONSISTENT STELLAR SYSTEMS

J. AN (안진혁)[1], N. W. EVANS[2], AND J. L. SANDERS[2]

Submitted 2016 October 5

ABSTRACT

Isolated, steady-state galaxies correspond to equilibrium solutions of the Poisson–Vlasov system. We show that (i) all galaxies with a distribution function depending on energy alone must be spherically symmetric and (ii) all axisymmetric galaxies with a distribution function depending on energy and the angular momentum component parallel to the symmetry axis must also be reflection-symmetric about the plane $z = 0$. The former result is Lichtenstein's Theorem, derived here by a method exploiting symmetries of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations, while the latter result is new. These results are subsumed into the *Symmetry Theorem*, which specifies how the symmetries of the distribution function in configuration or velocity space can control the planes of reflection symmetries of the ensuing stellar system.

Subject headings: galaxies: kinematics and dynamics – galaxies: structure

1. INTRODUCTION

As Richard P. Feynman once noted, "symmetry is fascinating to the human mind, and everyone likes objects or patterns that are in some way symmetrical" (Feynman, Leighton & Sands 1964, chap. 52-1). But, is symmetry simply a construction of the human mind seeking simplicity and beauty (and so, do we tend to notice symmetry more)? Or, are we more interested in such things as symmetry because the nature and the universe indeed favor them?

Overzealous physicists have often been ridiculed for imagining "spherical cows". Nevertheless even real cows (in fact, most animals including humans) exhibit bilateral symmetry (i.e. approximate reflection symmetry about the sagittal plane) to some degree, whereas traditional objects which astronomers have investigated such as stars (cf. Kuhn et al. 2012) and planets[3] are indeed highly symmetrical. We are left to ponder why some things in nature are indeed symmetric (provided that the presence of such symmetry does not simply betray our own bias). For instance, cows are bilaterally symmetric owing to evolutionary reasons (e.g., Finnerty 2005), whereas the stars and planets are nearly spherical because the equation for the hydrostatic equilibrium demands them to be so (Lichtenstein's theorem – see e.g., Lindblom 1992; Grossman 1996). The situation is somewhat more complicated for stellar systems such as star clusters, galaxies, galaxy clusters etc. However, many of these objects are observed to be symmetrical, if in lesser degrees, and most asymmetric features in them may simply be transitory, the results of merging and accretion, or ongoing star-formation.

The shapes of isolated, steady-state stellar systems are controlled by gravity. In such systems, the phase space distribution function (DF) satisfies the collisionless Boltzmann equation (CBE) involving the Newtonian potential, which is also coupled to the density (i.e. an integrated DF) through Poisson's equation. This imposes severe restrictions on the possible intrinsic shapes of systems. In fact, all known equilibrium models of stellar systems are highly symmetric. Spherically symmetric models were first studied by James H. Jeans and Arthur S. Eddington nearly a century ago. Algorithms to find both isotropic and anisotropic DFs for spherical galaxies are now well-established (e.g., Eddington 1916; Osipkov 1979; Merritt 1985; Dejonghe 1986; Evans & An 2006). Methods to build axisymmetric models with DFs depending on the two classical integrals (energy E and angular momentum component parallel to the symmetry axis L_z) are also known (Lynden-Bell 1962; Hunter & Qian 1993), together with some exact solutions (Toomre 1982; Evans 1993). Both spherically symmetric and axisymmetric models contain an infinite number of reflectional planes of symmetry. There are a very few triaxial models with DFs known (Vandervoort 1980; Hunter & de Zeeuw 1992; Sanders & Evans 2015). However, even triaxial models have three reflectional symmetries in the principal planes (the D_{2h} point group). This led Tremaine (1993) to ask whether equilibrium models of stellar systems with still fewer symmetries can exist.

The principal result in this area was established in the early years of the last century by Lichtenstein (1928, see also Grossman 1996 for an accessible treatment). Lichtenstein studied self-gravitating, barotropic fluids and showed that if there is a constant vector $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$ such that the velocity field $\boldsymbol{v}$ are stratified on the set of planes perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$ (viz. $\boldsymbol{v} \cdot \hat{\mathbb{k}} = 0$ everywhere), then the figure has a symmetry plane perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$. For a static fluid, there is a symmetry plane perpendicular to every axis. Hence, all isolated, static, self-gravitating, barotropic fluids must be spherical. The extension of this result to stellar dynamics is given in Binney & Tremaine (2008). They pointed out that stellar dynamical models with ergodic DFs $f(E)$ satisfy the self-same equations – Poisson's equation, hydrostatic equilibrium and density constant on equipotentials – as barotropic self-gravitating fluids. Thus, any isolated, static, self-gravitating, ergodic stellar system must also be spherically symmetric.

In this paper, we investigate whether one can generalize such arguments to constrain the shape of relaxed stellar systems. In Sect. 2, we first examine the idealized one dimensional case, which reduces the fundamental mathematical principle to the level of elementary calculus. It also provides the physical insight into why asymmetric stellar dynamical equilibria may be unsustainable. In Sect. 3, we then borrow some results found in the mathematical literature, which es-

[1] National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, A20 Datun Road, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100012, China
[2] Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK
[3] According to the 2006 26th IAU General Assembly Resolution 5A, the planets are *defined* to be in "a hydrostatic equilibrium (nearly round) shape".

sentially develop the one-dimensional analytical idea so as to be applicable for higher dimensions. These results are used to recover Lichtenstein's Theorem in Sect. 4. Then our focus turns to stellar dynamics and we establish new results on the symmetries of stellar systems in Sect. 5.

2. ONE DIMENSIONAL CASE

Let us consider the one-dimensional (1-d) stellar system in a steady-state equilibrium with the potential $\Phi(x)$. The system is described by the distribution function (DF) $F(x, v)$ that is a solution to the collisionless Boltzmann equation (CBE), sometimes also called the Vlasov equation,

$$\cancel{\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}} + v\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} - \frac{d\Phi}{dx}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v} = 0, \tag{1}$$

whose general solution is found via the method of characteristics to be $F(x, v) = f(v^2/2 + \Phi)$, where $f(E)$ is an arbitrary non-negative function of E. In other words, any distribution satisfying the 1-d time-independent CBE must be constant on the hyper-surfaces of constant energy $E = v^2/2 + \Phi(x)$ (Jeans' Theorem). The density ρ of the system follows integrating the DF over the momentum (i.e. velocity) space;

$$\rho = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv\, F(x, v) = \sqrt{2}\int_{\Phi}^{\infty} \frac{f(E)\, dE}{\sqrt{E - \Phi}}, \tag{2}$$

which depends on the position only through the potential. That is to say, the local density of the 1-d steady-state stellar system is constant on locations with equal value of the potential and so the density may be considered as a function of the potential. If the potential is generated self-consistently by the density field, then it must satisfy the 1-d Poisson equation $d^2\Phi/dx^2 = 2G\rho(\Phi)$, which then results in an autonomous (i.e. not involving the independent variable x explicitly) ordinary differential equation.

2.1. *A Simple Example*

An insightful example is provided by the one-dimensional asymmetric harmonic potential well

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}a_1 x^2 & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ \frac{1}{2}a_2 x^2 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Assuming there is an energy cut-off E_0, then

$$\frac{d^2\Phi}{dx^2} = \begin{cases} a_1 & \text{for } x \in (0, \sqrt{2E_0/a_1}), \\ a_2 & \text{for } x \in (-\sqrt{2E_0/a_2}, 0), \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

so this corresponds to two uniform density slabs of stars joined at $x = 0$. In each half-space, the DF required to generate the constant density can be found by inverting equation (2) using Abel's equation as

$$f(E) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{a_1}{2^{3/2}\pi G\sqrt{E_0 - E}} & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ \dfrac{a_2}{2^{3/2}\pi G\sqrt{E_0 - E}} & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Although this solves the fundamental integral equation for the density, this is not a solution of the collisionless Boltzmann equation. It violates Jeans' Theorem, as it depends on the sign of x, which is not an integral of motion.

An orbit within the given 1-d potential well is characterized by its energy E alone. The local density due to a star of the mass m on an orbit of the energy E (via time averaging) is then $(2m/P)[2(E - \Phi)]^{-1/2}$ (where $P/2$ is the half-period of the orbit) for the location with $\Phi(x) < E$. The total density of the system is made up from adding up the contributions of different orbits with positive definite weights $f(E)dE = m/P$ (see eq. 2). However, equation (5) does not correspond to a unique orbital weight function as the scaling is dependent on the location. With a fixed weight, the orbital density $\propto (E - \Phi)^{-1/2}$ results in the identical density for $\rho(x_1) = \rho(x_2)$ if $\Phi(x_1) = \Phi(x_2)$ and $x_2 < 0 < x_1$ – that is, $\rho = \rho[\Phi(x)]$. For an asymmetric potential well, this is contrary to the requirements of self-consistency.

For any orbit, the stars spend more time in the half-space $x < 0$ than $x > 0$, which is the contrary of what is needed for self-consistency. This is the underlying physical reason why asymmetric stellar dynamical equilibria are unsustainable in one dimension (and perhaps may even be unsustainable in three dimensions).

2.2. *General Theorem*

We now show that, if there is a critical position in a 1-d potential, then the potential and the density must be reflection-symmetric with respect to the critical point. The proof may be constructed via solving Poisson's equation at least formally for the solution. In particular, if $N(\Phi)$ is the anti-derivative of $4G\rho$ considered as a function of Φ, that is, $dN(\Phi)/d\Phi = 4G\rho$, then Poisson equation's implies

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left[\left(\frac{d\Phi}{dx}\right)^2 - N(\Phi)\right] = 2\left(\frac{d^2\Phi}{dx^2} - 2G\rho\right)\frac{d\Phi}{dx} = 0. \tag{6}$$

In other word, $(\Phi')^2 - N(\Phi)$ is constant for all positions (within a connected interval over which Φ is finite). Next suppose that there exists x_0 such that $\Phi'(x_0) = 0$. Then at any location x, the potential satisfies

$$\left(\frac{d\Phi}{dx}\right)^2 = N(\Phi) - N(\Phi_0) = 4G\int_{\Phi_0}^{\Phi} \rho\, d\Phi = D(\Phi) \geq 0, \tag{7}$$

where $\Phi_0 = \Phi(x_0)$, which should be the global minimum of Φ (i.e. $\Phi \geq \Phi_0$), provided that $\rho \geq 0$ everywhere (conversely, if $\rho \leq 0$ everywhere, then $\Phi \leq \Phi_0$) in order for $D(\Phi)$ to be non-negative. Equation (7) also indicates that $|dx/d\Phi| = D^{-1/2}$ and so follows (assuming $\rho \geq 0$ and $\Phi \geq \Phi_0$) that

$$|x - x_0| = \int_{\Phi_0}^{\Phi(x)} \frac{d\Phi}{\sqrt{D(\Phi)}}. \tag{8}$$

Unless $\rho(\Phi) = 0$ in an open neighborhood of $\Phi_0 = \Phi(x_0)$, $D(\Phi)$ is strictly positive and non-decreasing for $\Phi > \Phi_0$. It follows that the right-hand side of equation (8) is also a monotonic increasing function of $\Phi \geq \Phi_0$. Inverting equation (8) for $\Phi(x)$ as a function of x provides the solution to the Poisson equation with the initial condition that $\Phi'(x_0) = 0$ and $\Phi(x_0) = \Phi_0$. Equation (8) further suggests that $\Phi(x)$, given the initial condition, only depends on the distance $|x - x_0|$ to the critical point x_0, which is to say $\Phi(x)$ is symmetric under the reflection about $x = x_0$.

3. THE GIDAS–NI–NIRENBERG THEOREM

Although the one dimensional case elucidates the basic principle, applying this analytic result to three dimensional problems requires considerable mathematical finesse. Here, we note well-established results that generalize the discussion in the preceding section for multi-dimensional spaces.

The results by Gidas, Ni & Nirenberg (1979, 1981) are particularly notable in this respect. While their results are celebrated among those who study elliptic partial differential equations, they are not widely known in the astrophysical community. The most basic result of Gidas et al. (1979, henceforth GNN) is that

Theorem 1 (GNN1) *If $\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a positive C^2-function on the closed ball of radius R around the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla^2\psi + f(\psi) = 0 & (\|\boldsymbol{x}\| < R), \\ \psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0 & (\|\boldsymbol{x}\| = R), \end{cases}$$

where $f(\psi)$ is a C^1-function of ψ, then ψ is radially symmetric and $\partial\psi/\partial r < 0$ for $0 < r = \|\boldsymbol{x}\| < R$.

Extending to the whole space:

Theorem 2 (GNN4) *Let $\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ be a positive C^2-solution of*

$$\nabla^2\psi + f(\psi) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

with a C^1-function $f(\psi)$. If ψ admits the asymptotic expansion (with a fixed $m > 0$) up to a translation,

$$\psi = \frac{a_0}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m} + \frac{\sum_{i,j} a_{ij} x_i x_j}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m+4}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m+2}}\right) \quad (\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty)^4,$$

where $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then ψ is radially symmetric and $\partial\psi/\partial r < 0$ (where r is the radial coordinate).

This further generalizes:

Theorem 3 (GNN4') *If ψ is a positive C^2-solution of*

$$\nabla^2\psi + F(x_2, \ldots, x_n; \psi) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n$$

with a continuous $\partial F/\partial\psi$, and is expressible in the same asymptotic series as the preceding theorem, then ψ is symmetric under $\psi(-x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \psi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ and $\partial\psi/\partial x_1 < 0$ for $x_1 > 0$.

The theorems proved in GNN are of greater generality, as we have specialized to the specific case of Poisson's equation. The proofs are examples of the so-called moving plane method, which relies on the maximum principle for the solution to some classes of the elliptic partial differential equations (e.g., harmonic functions to the Laplace equation). However, we will not attempt to reproduce these proofs, but accept them as established facts to be applied. An accessible introduction for readers interested in the mathematical details is provided by the book of Fraenkel (2000). In the next two subsections, we demonstrate that the theorems of GNN can be applied directly to problems in gravitational physics. Readers willing to take this on trust can skip to the applications in Sects. 4 and 5.

3.1. *The continuity constraints*

Since $\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ is assumed to be C^2 (which is necessary for the Laplacian to be well-defined), the C^1-condition on $f(\psi)$ indicates that $-\nabla^2\psi = S_{n-1}\rho(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\psi(\boldsymbol{x}))$ (where S_{n-1} is the surface area of the unit $(n-1)$-sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$) is also continuously differentiable. Examining the proof in GNN however reveals that the actual necessary condition on $f(\psi)$ is Lipschitz continuity – i.e. $|f(\psi) - f(\phi)|/|\psi - \phi|$ is bounded for any ψ, ϕ in the relevant interval – which is again translated into $\rho(\boldsymbol{x})$ being Lipschitz-continuous. Since $\rho(\boldsymbol{x})$ should be continuous (implied by $\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ being C^2), the Lipschitz continuity of $\rho(\boldsymbol{x})$ indicates that all the one-sided directional derivatives of $\rho(\boldsymbol{x})$ are bounded. If the support of $\rho(\boldsymbol{x})$ is a bounded set, then the Lipschitz-continuous density must tend linearly (or faster) to zero as it approaches to the boundary. This appears to exclude any density profile with hard boundaries. Nevertheless, the remarks found in sect. 2.3 of GNN indicate that the result holds also if $f = f_1 + f_2$ where f_1 is C^1 and f_2 is monotonic increasing. This then indicates that the theorem is still applicable to any localized density profile, provided that the density actually decays to zero near the boundary.

3.2. *The asymptotic behavior of the potential*

The assumed form of the asymptotic behavior for the solution in the whole space follows not only the definite power-law decay but also from the regularity of $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m\psi$ at the point at infinity. For example, any potential generated by the localized source is found utilizing Green's function ($n \geq 3$)

$$\frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}\|^m} = \frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m}\left(1 - \frac{2\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{y}\|^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\right)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \equiv \boldsymbol{x}/\|\boldsymbol{x}\|$ and $m = n - 2$. In particular, for $n \geq 3$, the solution to the Poisson equation $\nabla^2\psi + S_{n-1}\rho = 0$ is

$$\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{m}\int \frac{\rho(\boldsymbol{y})\, d^n\boldsymbol{y}}{\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}\|^m}. \tag{10}$$

Provided that the support for $\rho(\boldsymbol{y})$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded set, the asymptotic expansion of equation (9) as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$ leads to

$$\psi = \frac{M}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^m}\left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}\cdot\boldsymbol{y}_0}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|}\right) + \frac{\sum_{i,j} Q_{ij} x_i x_j}{2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m+4}} + O\left(\frac{1}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{m+3}}\right) \tag{11}$$

where M and $\boldsymbol{y}_0$ is the total mass and the center of mass,

$$M \equiv \int d^n\boldsymbol{y}\, \rho(\boldsymbol{y}); \quad \boldsymbol{y}_0 \equiv \frac{1}{M}\int d^n\boldsymbol{y}\, \boldsymbol{y}\rho(\boldsymbol{y}), \tag{12}$$

while $Q_{ij} \equiv nR_{ij} - \mathrm{Tr}(\mathsf{R})\delta_{ij}$ is the quadrupole moment tensor, δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta and $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathsf{R}) = \sum_i R_{ii}$ is the trace of the matrix $\mathsf{R} = (R_{ij})$ whose elements are given by

$$R_{ij} \equiv \int d^n\boldsymbol{y}\, y_i y_j \rho(\boldsymbol{y}). \tag{13}$$

Once the center of mass is chosen as the coordinate origin, the asymptotic expansion in equation (10) reduces to the form assumed in the theorem with $m = n - 2 > 0$ for $n > 2$. In other words, the theorem is directly applicable to the potential due to any (continuous) localized density in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 3$).

On the other hand, if the density extends to infinity like $\rho \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(n+\alpha)}$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the potential decays asymptotically like $(n-2)\psi \sim M/\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{n-2} \to 0$, provided that the finite total mass M is defined (which is possible if $\alpha > 0$). However, $\delta M = M - M_r \sim r^{-\alpha}$ as $r \to \infty$ (where M_r is the mass within the radius r) and so $\partial\psi/\partial r \sim M_r/r^{n-1} = r^{1-n}(M - \delta M) \sim r^{1-n}(M - C/r^\alpha)$ as $r \to \infty$. It follows that $\psi \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{2-n}[M/(n-2) - \tilde{C}/\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^\alpha]$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$; that is, the regularity assumption actually requires a steeper density fall-off (i.e. $\alpha \geq 2$) than the requirement of a finite total mass.

Nevertheless, it can still be argued that the result holds for a potential generated by any finite mass system. According to Parcella & Ramaswamy (2008, theorem 2.6),

[4] Here $f(x) = o(g(x))$ indicates that $\lim_{x\to\infty}|f(x)/g(x)| = 0$. By contrast, $f(x) = O(g(x))$ implies $\lim_{x\to\infty}|f(x)/g(x)| = {}^\exists M$ where M is finite.

Theorem 4 *Suppose that there exist $\psi_0, \chi > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{f(\phi) - f(\psi)}{\phi - \psi} \leq C(\phi + \psi)^{\chi}$$

for $0 < {}^{\forall}\psi < {}^{\forall}\phi < \psi_0$. Then the positive solution $\psi(\boldsymbol{x})$ of $\nabla^2\psi + f(\psi) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, decaying like $\psi = O(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-m}) \to 0$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$ with $m\chi > 2$ is radially symmetric (and strictly decreasing about the center).

For an increasing function $f(\psi)$, the inequality may heuristically be interpreted as indicating that $f'(\psi) = O(\psi^{\chi})$ as $\psi \to 0$ (cf. the mean value theorem). This further suggests that $S_{n-1}\rho(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\psi(\boldsymbol{x})) = O(\psi^{\chi+1}) = O(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-m(\chi+1)})$ and so the condition $m\chi > 2$ results in a definite power-law decay of $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2\rho/\psi = O(\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(m\chi-2)})$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$. As noted, with $\rho \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(n+\alpha)}$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$, the total mass is finite and the potential decays like $\psi \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(n-2)}$ if $\alpha > 0$. Then this behavior also indicates that $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2\rho/\psi \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-\alpha} \to 0$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$.

The solution to the Poisson equation in GNN4' is also the extremum (i.e. $\delta S = 0$) for the action (here $\partial G/\partial\psi = F$)

$$S \equiv \int_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n} d^n\boldsymbol{x}\left[\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi\|^2}{2} - G(x_2, \ldots, x_n; \psi)\right] \tag{14}$$

with the boundary condition $\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|\to\infty}\psi(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$. Then the asymptotic behavior requirement for the potential is basically equivalent to the convergence condition for the action (defined as an integral over the whole space). In particular, $G/\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi\|^2 \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2\rho/\psi$ (NB: $\partial G/\partial\psi = F \sim \rho$) as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$ and so, with the density decaying like $\rho \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(n+\alpha)}$ with $\alpha > 0$ as $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \to \infty$, the asymptotic behavior of the Lagrangian density for the action in equation (14) is always dominated by the kinetic term $\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi\|^2$. For a potential due to a finite mass, $\psi \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-(n-2)}$ and thus $\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\psi\|^2 \sim \|\boldsymbol{x}\|^{-2(n-1)}$; that is, the integral S in equation (14) is defined (provided $n \geq 3$).

4. LICHTENSTEIN'S THEOREM

Henceforth, we restrict ourselves to three dimensional space. In addition, we also revert to the physics sign convention for the potential – namely that the acceleration is directed along the downhill direction of the potential, $\boldsymbol{g} = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi$, which results in the Poisson equation of $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho$. For a non-negative density $\rho \geq 0$, the usual zero-point $\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|\to\infty}\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ then implies that the potential is actually negative. The GNN theorems however are still applicable once we consider the relative potential or the positive potential $\psi = -\Phi = |\Phi|$ instead.

Before we discuss the application of the GNN theorems to stellar dynamics, we first note its relation to a famous result in fluid mechanics, namely

Theorem 5 (Lichtenstein) *A time-independent barotropic fluid solution to the coupled Euler–Poisson equation*

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla})\boldsymbol{v} + \boldsymbol{\nabla}p + \rho\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi = 0; \quad \nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho,$$

with a stratified velocity field such that $\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\hat{\mathbb{k}} = 0$ (where $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$ is a fixed unit vector) is symmetric with respect to the reflection about a plane perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$. Furthermore, if the fluid is in a static equilibrium, the system must also be spherically symmetric about the center of mass (and reflection symmetric with respect to any plane passing the center).

This result predates the GNN theorems (e.g., see Lindblom 1992; Grossman 1996, references therein). However, Lichtenstein's theorem is essentially a corollary to the GNN theorems. Following the barotropic assumption, it is possible to define a state function ("specific enthalpy");

$$h(p) = \int_0^p \frac{d\tilde{p}}{\rho(\tilde{p})}, \tag{15}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\nabla}h = \boldsymbol{\nabla}p/\rho$. Then, the Euler equation is reducible to

$$(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla})\boldsymbol{v} + \boldsymbol{\nabla}(h + \Phi) = 0, \tag{16}$$

and the dot product to the fixed vector $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$ in the Cartesian z-coordinate direction results in $(\partial/\partial z)(h + \Phi) = 0$; that is, $h + \Phi = C(x, y)$ is independent of the coordinate z where $C(x, y)$ is an arbitrary function of the coordinate components (x, y) on the plane perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$. Applying the Laplacian on $h + \Phi = C$ and using Poisson's equation then yields

$$\nabla^2 h + 4\pi G\rho(p) - \nabla^2 C(x, y) = 0. \tag{17}$$

Since $\rho \geq 0$, the enthalpy is a positive increasing function of the pressure. Thus, $h(p)$ is in principle invertible for the pressure as a function of the enthalpy, $p = p(h)$, and the barotropic density can also be considered as a function of the enthalpy, $\rho(p(h))$. Then equation (17) is in the form of $\nabla^2 h + f_1(x, y; h) = 0$ and the GNN theorem implies that the solution $h(\boldsymbol{r})$ is reflection-symmetric, $h(x, y, -z) = h(x, y, z)$ with respect to a properly chosen mid-plane. Since the pressure and the density are functions of the enthalpy, they are also symmetric under the same reflection.

Alternatively, Poisson's equation directly indicates $\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho(p)$ but $p = p(h) = p[C(x, y) - \Phi]$; that is, $\nabla^2\psi + f_2(x, y; \psi) = 0$ with $f_2 = 4\pi G\rho[p(C + \psi)]$ where $\psi = -\Phi$. The reflection symmetry of Φ is then the result of GNN, while those of h, p, ρ follow $h = C - \Phi$.

Spherical symmetry is an immediate corollary to the reflection symmetry, since $\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\hat{\mathbb{k}} = 0$ for any $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$ in the static system. In fact, the barotropic assumption in a static equilibrium is redundant, as the barotropy automatically follows the static Euler equation. In particular, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\times(\boldsymbol{\nabla}p + \rho\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi) = \boldsymbol{\nabla}\rho\times\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi = 0$; that is, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\rho \parallel \boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi$ (or $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\rho = 0$), and so $\rho = \rho(\Phi)$. Then the system must be spherically symmetric following GNN – since the pressure must also be spherically symmetric (and monotonic), the resulting spherically symmetric density is obviously barotropic too.

5. APPLICATIONS ON STELLAR DYNAMICS

5.1. *Ergodic distribution functions*

In the one dimensional case, the general solution to the time-independent CBE is an arbitrary function of the specific energy. The Jeans theorem generalizes this for a three dimensional system; that is, if (I_1, I_2, I_3) is the set of three independent (isolating) integrals of motion (admitted by the one-particle Hamiltonian), any DF (comprised of many identical particles governed by the same one-particle Hamiltonian) in equilibrium must be constant over the joint level surfaces of (I_1, I_2, I_3) in phase space. This is usually stated as the DF is a function of the integrals, $F(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{v}) = f(I_1, I_2, I_3)$.

Since any time-independent Hamiltonian is itself an integral of motion, the simplest DF in equilibrium is of the form $f(\mathcal{H})$. The Hamiltonian of a free particle in a fixed potential Φ is $\mathcal{H} = \|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2/2 + \Phi$. As the Hamiltonian is isotropic, the local density resulting from the DF of $f(\mathcal{H})$ is then

$$\rho = 4\pi\int_0^\infty dv\, v^2 F(x, v) = 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\pi\int_\Phi^\infty d\mathcal{H}\,\sqrt{\mathcal{H} - \Phi}\, f(\mathcal{H}), \tag{18}$$

which again depends on position only through the potential, $\rho = \rho(\Phi)$. Therefore, following GNN, we conclude

Theorem 6 *The stellar dynamical system specified by an ergodic DF, $F(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{v}) = f(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2/2 + \Phi)$, must be spherically symmetric about the center of mass, provided that the total mass of the system is finite and the potential Φ has been generated self-consistently without any external potential.*

The result is established using Lichtenstein's theorem in Binney & Tremaine (2008, Box 4.1). However, the barotropy assumption makes it difficult to generalize this approach for other stellar dynamic systems, for which the scalar pressure is not necessarily defined. In fact, the sphericity of the system is a more direct consequence of the fact that the density is stratified over the equipotential surface, and the barotropy, which must follow an ergodic DF (see Binney & Tremaine 2008, Box 4.1), is incidental.

This result may be considered as a special case of a more general one established by Eddington (1915) and Camm (1941), who showed that, if the DF depends on a single integral quadratic in the velocities, then the self-consistent system is spherically symmetric. This includes the so-called Osipkov–Merritt DFs in addition to the ergodic DFs.

5.2. *Two-integral distribution functions*

The results of GNN can also be applied to other related systems. In particular,

Theorem 7 *Consider a stellar dynamical system in an axisymmetric (about the z-axis) potential Φ. Suppose the system is specified by the two-integral DF, $F(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v}) = f(E, L_z)$ where E is the specific energy and $L_z = \boldsymbol{L} \cdot \hat{\mathbb{k}} = xv_y - yv_x$ is the z-component of the specific angular momentum ($\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{r} \times \boldsymbol{v}$). If the total mass of the system is finite and the potential Φ has been generated self-consistently without any external potential, the system must be symmetric with respect to the reflection about the plane passing through the center of mass and perpendicular to the z-axis (or equivalently the vector $\hat{\mathbb{k}}$).*

The axial component of the angular momentum, L_z is an integral of motion for the Hamiltonian of a natural system with an axisymmetric potential $\Phi(R, z)$ where $R^2 = x^2 + y^2$, and so the two-integral DF $f(E, L_z)$ is indeed a solution to the CBE. In cylindrical coordinates (R, ϕ, z), the integral L_z is also the conjugate momentum to the coordinate ϕ, that is, $L_z = p_\phi = \partial\mathscr{L}/\partial\dot{\phi} = R^2\dot{\phi} = Rv_\phi$ where $\mathscr{L} = (\dot{R}^2 + R^2\dot{\phi}^2 + \dot{z}^2)/2 - \Phi(R, z)$ is the Lagrangian of the system, while $(v_R, v_\phi, v_z) = (\dot{R}, R\dot{\phi}, \dot{z})$ is the velocity component projected onto the orthonormal coordinate frames. Since $E = (v_R^2 + v_\phi^2 + v_z^2)/2 + \Phi$, the density due to the DF $f(E, L_z)$ is obtained by the integral,

$$\rho = 2\pi \iint\limits_{v_\varphi \geq 0} F(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v})\, v_\varphi\, dv_\varphi\, dv_\phi = \frac{2\pi}{R} \iint\limits_{L_z^2 \leq 2R^2(E-\Phi)} dE\, dL_z\, f(E, L_z), \tag{19}$$

where $v_\varphi^2 = v_R^2 + v_z^2$. Here the density ρ is also axisymmetric (i.e. independent of the azimuth ϕ). Furthermore, equation (19) indicates that the z-dependence of the density is only through the potential Φ, that is, $\rho = \rho(R, \Phi)$. Then Poisson's equation for a self-consistent system leads to the partial differential equation on $\psi = -\Phi$ as in $\nabla^2\psi + 4\pi G\rho[\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}, -\psi] = 0$, which is the form considered in the theorem of GNN4'. Therefore the potential Φ is reflection symmetric with respect to a plane perpendicular to the z-axis (which may be considered as the $z = 0$ mid-plane without loss of generality) and the conclusion of Theorem 7 thus holds. In particular, the symmetry of the density immediately follows the symmetry of the potential, $\rho(R, -z) = \rho[R, \Phi(R, -z)] = \rho[R, \Phi(R, z)] = \rho(R, z)$ (and so the center of mass consequently lies on the mid-plane), while the symmetry of the velocity distribution is a simple consequence of the symmetry of both E and L_z. Although, in most studies, an axisymmetric two-integral system is usually assumed to be symmetric about the reflection with respect to the mid-plane, the assumption appears not to have been explicitly proven previously (see however Rein & Guo 2003, sect. 3).

5.3. *Symmetric distributions*

The Jeans theorem states that the time-independent DF $F(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{v})$ satisfying the CBE is an integral of motion. Therefore the Poisson bracket between the steady-state DF and the Hamiltonian identically vanishes;

$$\{\mathcal{H}, F\} = \sum_j \left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial q^j} \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_j} - \frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q^j} \right) = 0. \tag{20}$$

In one dimension, the resulting relation $(\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial q)(\partial F/\partial p) = (\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial p)(\partial F/\partial q)$ implies that the general solution is $F = f(\mathcal{H})$. While $\{\mathcal{H}, f(\mathcal{H})\} = 0$ for any function $F = f(\mathcal{H})$ in higher dimension, the ergodic DF is not of course the most general solution to the CBE. However, if the DF is known to satisfy a particular coordinate part of $\{\mathcal{H}, F\} = 0$ separately from the remainder, say $(\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial q^1)(\partial F/\partial p_1) = (\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial p_1)(\partial F/\partial q^1)$, then, at a fixed set for the rest of the coordinates $(q^2, q^3; p_2, p_3)$, the DF must be constant on the level surface of $\mathcal{H}$, that is, $F = f(\mathcal{H}; q^2, q^3; p_2, p_3)$. Provided that the Jacobian determinant $|(dp_1 dp_2 dp_3)/d^3\boldsymbol{v}| = |d^3\boldsymbol{x}/(dq^1 dq^2 dq^3)|$ is independent of q^1, the density resulting from the particular DF is of the form $\rho = \rho(q^2, q^3; \Phi)$.

Less abstractly, suppose the DF is such that the CBE in rectangular Cartesian coordinates rearranged as

$$v_x \frac{\partial F}{\partial x} + v_y \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_x} - \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial y}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_y} = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial z}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_z} - v_z \frac{\partial F}{\partial z} \tag{21}$$

is satisfied by both left and right hand sides vanishing separately. Then the general solution for the vanishing right hand side is found to be $F = f(v_z^2/2 + \Phi; x, y; v_x, v_y)$ via the method of characteristics (e.g., Garabedian 1998) – here $v_z^2/2 + \Phi = \mathcal{H} - (v_x^2 + v_y^2)/2$ and so the DF is indeed of the form $F = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}; x, y; v_x = p_x, v_y = p_y)$ albeit with a different function $\tilde{f}$. The density resulting from this DF is found from the integral (where $E_z = v_z^2/2 + \Phi$)

$$\rho = \sqrt{2} \iiint\limits_{E \geq \Phi} dv_x\, dv_y\, dE_z \frac{f(E_z; x, y; v_x, v_y)}{\sqrt{E_z - \Phi}}, \tag{22}$$

whose z-dependence is only through Φ, namely, $\rho = \rho(\Phi; x, y)$. This is again the form of the source term for Poisson's equation assumed for the GNN theorem, and so it follows that the potential Φ and the density ρ are reflection symmetric with respect to a plane perpendicular to the z-axis. Since the DF is also an even function of v_z, the velocity distribution is invariant under the same reflection too.

How can the DF satisfy the Cartesian z part of the CBE separately from the (x, y) part? Let us observe that, with $F = f(v_z^2/2 + \Phi; x, y; v_x, v_y)$, equation (21) divides the even and odd

parts on v_z to two opposite side. In general, an arbitrary DF may be decomposed into $F(x,y,z,;v_x,v_y,v_z) = F^+_{v_z}+F^-_{v_z}$ where $2F^\pm_{v_z} \equiv F(x,y,z,;v_x,v_y,v_z) \pm F(x,y,z,;v_x,v_y,-v_z)$. The CBE for the even-odd decomposed DF is then itself reassembled separately for the even and odd parts, which results in

$$\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial z}\frac{\partial F^\pm_{v_z}}{\partial v_z} - v_z\frac{\partial F^\pm_{v_z}}{\partial z} = \left(v_x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + v_y\frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial v_x} - \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial v_y}\right)F^\mp_{v_z}. \quad (23)$$

Hence, if $F^-_{v_z} = 0$, then $F = F^+_{v_z} = f(v_z^2/2+\Phi; x, y; v_x, v_y)$;

Theorem 8 *The finite-mass self-consistent stellar dynamic system specified by the steady-state DF such that $F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,-v_z) = F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$ must possess a plane of reflection symmetry perpendicular to the z-axis – i.e. there exists z_0 such that $\Phi(x,y,2z_0-z) = \Phi(x,y,z)$ and $\rho(x,y,2z_0-z) = \rho(x,y,z)$. The DF is also expressible as $F = f(v_z^2/2+\Phi; x, y; v_x, v_y) = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}; x, y; v_x, v_y)$ and so the whole system is also invariant under the reflection about the $z = z_0$ plane (i.e. $z \to 2z_0 - z$ and $v_z \to -v_z$).*

This actually supersedes Theorem 7, for $f(E, L_z)$ is invariant under $v_z \to -v_z$ given that $L_z = xv_y - yv_x$ is independent of v_z and $E = (v_x^2+v_y^2+v_z^2)/2+\Phi$ is an even function of v_z.

In fact, similar even-odd splits of the CBE can be applied for the DFs with alternative sets of symmetries. In particular, the most general result is:

Theorem 9 (The Symmetry Theorem) *The same conclusion as Theorem 8 holds if the DF is subject to any one of the alternative symmetries,*

1. $F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,-v_z) = F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$,
2. $F(x,y,z;-v_x,-v_y,v_z) = F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$,
3. $F(x,y,2z_0-z;v_x,v_y,v_z) = F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$, *or*
4. $F(2x_0-x,2y_0-y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z) = F(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$,

where x_0, y_0, z_0 are fixed constants.

Here, the even-odd splits based on the last two symmetry assumptions actually require the accompanying symmetry of the potential as in $\Phi(x,y,2z_0-z) = \Phi(x,y,z)$ or $\Phi(2x_0-x,2y_0-y,z) = \Phi(x,y,z)$. This however is a natural consequence of the self-consistency condition (once the symmetry of the density is established following the integration of the DF over the momentum space) and redundant.

Condition 3 appears to be same as the conclusion, but the conclusion is actually more restrictive. In fact, the condition 3 does *not* describe the proper reflection symmetry of the DF with respect to $z = z_0$ plane since it does not involve the transformation of the velocity field (i.e. the true reflection symmetry follows from invariance under $z \to 2z_0 - z$ and $v_z \to -v_z$). On the other hand, the conclusion of the theorem implies the reflection symmetry of the density, the potential and the DF, plus the DF being an even function of v_z.

Similarly, condition 4 is *not* in fact the true antipodal symmetry about the axis defined by $x = x_0$ and $y = y_0$ (i.e. the invariance under the 180°-rotation around the same axis). Rather the condition indicates that the density and the potential is antipodally symmetric while the velocity distributions in the axially antipodal points are invariant under the rigid translation (but not necessarily under 180°-rotation). Consequently, neither the DF with rectangular reflection symmetry nor the one with the axial rotational symmetry satisfy condition 4 unless some additional conditions are imposed on the behavior of the velocity distributions. One such condition for the axially symmetric DF would be the isotropy within the v_x-v_y plane as in $F = f(R,z;v_x^2+v_y^2,v_z)$, whereas the DF given by $F = f(x^2,y^2,z;v_x^2,v_y^2,v_z)$ is symmetric under the individual reflections, $x \to -x$ and $y \to -y$ and also satisfies the condition 4.

5.4. *Properties of Systems satisfying the Symmetry Theorem*

Since the DF in the form of $F = f(v_z^2+\Phi; x, y; v_x, v_y)$ is an even function of v_z, any velocity moment with an odd power to v_z for this system vanishes. According to An & Evans (2016, corollary 8), this implies the potential is separable

$$\Phi(x,y,z) = \phi(x,y) + \psi(z) \quad (24)$$

unless $(\langle v_x^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle)(\langle v_y^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle) = \langle v_xv_y\rangle^2$. However, separable potentials of the form (24) give rise to self-consistent density profiles like $\rho = \rho_1(x,y) + \rho_2(z)$, which cannot be of a finite total mass (except for $\rho = 0$).

Consequently, the DFs of Theorem 8 or 9 must also be constrained so that $(\langle v_x^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle)(\langle v_y^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle) = \langle v_xv_y\rangle^2$. Since $\langle v_xv_z\rangle = \langle v_yv_z\rangle = 0$, the characteristic polynomial of the matrix resulting from the stress tensor is given by $(\langle v_z^2\rangle - \lambda)[(\langle v_x^2\rangle - \lambda)(\langle v_y^2\rangle - \lambda) - \langle v_xv_y\rangle^2] = 0$. Then $\lambda = \langle v_z^2\rangle$ is one of the eigenvalues, whereas the constraints $(\langle v_x^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle)(\langle v_y^2\rangle - \langle v_z^2\rangle) = \langle v_xv_y\rangle^2$ is equivalent to $\langle v_z^2\rangle$ being one of the two remaining eigenvalues. In other words, the velocity ellipsoids must be spheroidal with its unequal axis aligned within the *x*-*y* plane or spherical everywhere. Note that the two-integral distribution $F = f(E, L_z)$ is an example of a DF satisfying such a constraint.

There are also restrictions on the potential (and the density through the self-consistency). In particular, the even-odd split of the CBE results in the additional partial differential equation

$$v_x\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} + v_y\frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_x} + \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial y}\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_y}. \quad (25)$$

Next, the *z*-derivative of this with the substitution $v_z(\partial F/\partial z) = (\partial\Phi/\partial z)(\partial F/\partial v_z)$ results in

$$\frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial x\partial z}\left(v_x\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_z} - v_z\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_x}\right) = \frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial y\partial z}\left(v_z\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_y} - v_y\frac{\partial F}{\partial v_z}\right). \quad (26)$$

However, the DF satisfying $v_z(\partial F/\partial z) = (\partial\Phi/\partial z)(\partial F/\partial v_z)$ is also expressible as $F = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}; x, y; v_x, v_y)$, and the partial derivatives of F with respect to the phase space coordinate $(x,y,z;v_x,v_y,v_z)$ are related to the partial derivatives of $\tilde{f}$ via

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial x}; \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial v_x} = v_x\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial v_x}, \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial z}\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial\mathcal{H}}; \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial v_z} = v_z\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial\mathcal{H}}. \quad (28)$$

Thus equation (26) reduces to a differential equation on $\tilde{f}$;

$$\frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial x\partial z}\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial v_x} + \frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial y\partial z}\frac{\partial\tilde{f}}{\partial v_y} = 0. \quad (29)$$

Here the second-order derivatives on Φ cannot be identically zero.[5] Then the general solution of equation (29) for $\tilde{f}$ at a fixed $(\mathcal{H}, x, y)$ follows the method of characteristics; that is, $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}; x, y; av_x + bv_y)$ where a, b should be functions of only (x, y)[6] that also satisfies

$$a(x,y)\frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial x\partial z} + b(x,y)\frac{\partial^2\Phi}{\partial y\partial z} = 0. \tag{30}$$

This is possible only if $[\partial^2\Phi/(\partial x\partial z)]/[\partial^2\Phi/(\partial y\partial z)]$ is independent of z. Equivalently, there exist functions a, b, c, d of (x, y) and $G(x, y, z)$ such that the potential is restricted to be

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x} &= c(x,y) + b(x,y)G(x,y,z);\\ \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial y} &= d(x,y) - a(x,y)G(x,y,z).\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In general, if equations (30) and (31) hold, we can introduce an orthonormal frame that is locally rotated relative to the rigid Cartesian frame such that the velocity components projected onto the frame are $(\hat{a}v_x + \hat{b}v_y, \hat{b}v_x - \hat{a}v_y, v_z)$ where $\hat{a} = a/(a^2 + b^2)^{1/2}$ and $\hat{b} = b/(a^2 + b^2)^{1/2}$. This frame then corresponds to the set of eigenvectors for the stress tensor resulting from the DF of $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}; x, y; av_x + bv_y)$ – in particular, $\langle(\hat{a}v_x + \hat{b}v_y)(\hat{b}v_x - \hat{a}v_y)\rangle = 0$. Furthermore, the resulting velocity dispersions are also constrained that $\langle(\hat{b}v_x - \hat{a}v_y)^2\rangle = \langle v_z^2\rangle$.

For example, with an axisymmetric potential $\Phi = \Phi(R, z)$ where $R^2 = x^2 + y^2$, we find that $\partial\Phi/\partial x = (x/R)(\partial\Phi/\partial R)$ and $\partial\Phi/\partial y = (y/R)(\partial\Phi/\partial R)$. Then $(a, b, c, d) = (-y, x, 0, 0)$ and $G = R^{-1}(\partial\Phi/\partial R)$, whereas $[\partial^2\Phi/(\partial x\partial z)]/[\partial^2\Phi/(\partial y\partial z)] = x/y$. In fact, the general solution to equation (29) in this case is then $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(\mathcal{H}, L_z; x, y)$ with $L_z = xv_y - yv_x$ but the CBE now reduces to $v_x(\partial\tilde{f}/\partial x) + v_y(\partial\tilde{f}/\partial y) = 0$ whose general solution is $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}(xv_y - yv_x)$ at a fixed $(\mathcal{H}, L_z)$. In other words, the only possible DFs in equilibrium with an axisymmetric but non-separable (i.e. $\partial^2\Phi/(\partial R\partial z) \neq 0$) potential subject to one of the conditions in the Symmetry Theorem 9 are the two-integral DFs of $F = f(E, L_z)$ (including the ergodic DF as a special case). As is well known, the resulting velocity ellipsoids of such DFs are all axially aligned ($\langle v_R v_\phi\rangle = 0$) with $\langle v_R^2\rangle = \langle v_z^2\rangle$.

6. CONCLUSIONS

There is an ample body of work on the reflection symmetries of isolated, self-gravitating, equilibrium fluid systems – or more colloquially, stars. It is already known that all isolated equilibrium stellar models have spatial symmetries (Lindblom 1992, and references therein). In Newtonian gravity, all non-rotating spherical models must be spherically symmetric. Also, all equilibrium stars must have a reflection symmetry perpendicular to the rotation axis of the star. Some of these results have even been extended to relativistic stars (see e.g., Lindblom & Masood-Ul-Alam 1994).

By contrast, the analogous problem in stellar dynamics has received scant attention. Isolated, self-gravitating, equilibrium stellar systems (or more colloquially, galaxies) must satisfy the Poisson and collisionless Boltzmann equations (also known as the Poisson–Vlasov system). This imposes strict requirements on the properties of the solutions, and hence on the shapes of stellar dynamical equilibria. Here, we have exploited symmetry theorems of elliptic differential equations (Gidas et al. 1979, 1981) to derive a number of new results, as well as to simplify the proofs of some pre-existing ones.

We have a given a new proof of the result that isolated systems with ergodic distribution functions $f(E)$ must be spherically symmetric. This was already known to Eddington (1915) and Camm (1941), whilst Binney & Tremaine (2008) show how it can be deduced from the famous theorem of Lichtenstein (1928) in fluid mechanics. We have also shown that axisymmetric two-integral distribution functions $f(E, L_z)$ must give rise to stellar systems with a plane of reflectional symmetry perpendicular to the symmetry axis (which can be taken without loss of generality as the plane $z = 0$). Finally, we have stated a new theorem – the Symmetry Theorem – which gives a set of sufficient conditions on the distribution function to ensure that the model has an underlying plane of reflectional symmetry.

Even so, there are still a number of outstanding open problems in this area, of which we highlight two. First, although the Symmetry Theorem provides sufficient conditions for the existence of a plane of reflectional symmetry, it does not provide necessary conditions. This is illustrated by the distribution functions of spheroidal Stäckel models (e.g., Dejonghe & de Zeeuw 1988). What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a plane of reflectional symmetry? Second, as pointed out by Tremaine (1993), all known isolated, static, stellar dynamical equilibria are highly symmetric – either spherical, axisymmetric or triaxial. They have at least three planes of reflectional symmetry. Do static, isolated, stellar dynamical equilibria with fewer symmetries exist? Our analysis of the one-dimensional problem strongly suggests that the answer to this question is negative.

Of course, the problem of the shapes of equilibrium models is not just of academic interest. Many galaxies are clearly not in equilibrium, being still shaped by violent merging and accretion events or ongoing star-formation. However, there are isolated, steady-state galaxies known, as well as galaxies in the voids of large-scale structure (e.g., Sulentic et al. 2006). Their equilibrium shapes will ultimately be controlled by the balance between gravity and motion (or more accurately, gradient of the momentum flux), rather than the effects of environment. It is to these lonely souls that our work is directly applicable.

This paper originated from the discussion during the first author's visit to the Institute of Astronomy (Cambridge), which was supported in part by the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC, UK)'s Consolidated Grant award to University of Cambridge. Work by JA is supported by the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Fellowships for Young International Scientists (Grant No.:2009Y2AJ7) and also grants from the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC), including "LAMOST and Galactic Dynamics (Grant No.:11390372)". JLS thanks the STFC for financial support.

[5] If otherwise, the potential is separable, leading to an infinite mass.

[6] Formally a, b can be functions of $(\mathcal{H}, x, y)$. However, Φ is a function of (x, y, z) while z and $\mathcal{H}$ are independent of each other at a fixed (x, y).

REFERENCES

An, J., & Evans, N. W. 2016, ApJ, 816, 35
Binney, J., & Tremaine, S. 2008, Galactic Dynamics (2nd edn.; Princeton: Princeton University Press)
Camm, G. L. 1941, MNRAS, 101, 195
Dejonghe, H. 1986, Phys. Rep., 133, 217
Dejonghe, H., & de Zeeuw, T. 1988, ApJ, 333, 90
Eddington, A. S. 1915, MNRAS, 76, 37
Eddington, A. S. 1916, MNRAS, 76, 572
Evans, N. W. 1993, MNRAS, 260, 191
Evans, N. W., & An, J. H. 2006, Phys. Rev. D, 73, 023524
Feynman, R., Leighton, R., & Sands, M. 1964, The Feynman Lectures on Physics, Vol. I, Mainly Mechanics, Radiation, and Heat (Boston: Addison-Wesley)
Finnerty, J. R. 2005, BioEssays, 27, 1174
Fraenkel, J. 2000, An Introduction to Maximum Problems and Symmetry in Elliptic Problems (Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press)
Garabedian, P. R. 1998, Partial Differential Equations (New York: Chelsea Publishing)
Gidas, B., Ni, W.-M., & Nirenberg, L. 1979, CMaPh, 68, 209
Gidas, B., Ni, W.-M., & Nirenberg, L. 1981, Math. Anal. Appl.: Part A, Advances in Math. Suppl. Studies 7A, ed. L. Nachbin (New York: Academic Press), 369
Grossman, N. 1996, The Sheer Joy of Celestial Mechanics (Basel: Birkhäuser)
Hunter, C., & de Zeeuw, P. T. 1992, ApJ, 389, 79
Hunter, C., & Qian, E. 1993, MNRAS, 262, 401
Kuhn, J. R., Bush, R., Emilio, M., & Scholl, I. F. 2012, Sci, 337, 1638
Lichtenstein, L. 1928, MatZe, 28, 635
Lindblom, L. 1992, RSPTA, 340, 353
Lindblom, L., & Masood-Ul-Alam, A. K. M. 1994, CMaPh, 162, 123
Lynden-Bell, D. 1962, MNRAS, 123, 447
Merritt, D. 1985, AJ, 90, 1027
Osipkov, L. P. 1979, PAZh, 5, 77 (*English* translation in SvAL, 5, 42)
Parcella, P., & Ramaswamy, R. 2008, Handbook of Differential Equations: Stationary Partial Differential Equations. Vol. 6, ed. M. Chipot (Amsterdam: North-Holland), 269
Rein, G., & Guo, Y. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 1296
Sanders, J. L., & Evans, N. W. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 299
Sulentic, J. W., Verdes-Montenegro, L., Bergond, G., et al. 2006, A&A, 449, 937
Toomre, A. 1982, ApJ, 259, 535
Tremaine, S. 1993, Back to the Galaxy, ed. S. S. Holt & F. Verter (New York: American Institute of Physics), 599
Vandervoort, P. O. 1980, ApJ, 240, 478